

THE MADRAS LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Thursday, the 13th February 1958.

The House met in the Council Chamber, Fort St. George, at three of the clock, Mr. Chairman (THE HON. DR. P. V. CHERIAN) in the Chair.

I—QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

STARRED QUESTIONS.

Temple at Vellore Fort

*11 *Q*.—SRI T. PURUSHOTHAM: Will the Hon. the Minister for Home be pleased to state with reference to the answers to supplementaries to the Legislative Council Question No. 127-A, dated 27th December 1956—

(*a*) whether any reply has been received by the State Government from the Government of India in regard to the revival of puja in the temple at Vellore Fort; and

(*b*) if so, the further action taken or proposed to be taken to reinstall the sacred idol for worship in the temple?

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM: (*a*) A reply was received from the Government of India stating that they do not find it possible to agree, after renovation and rebuilding, to declaring open for public worship or remove from protection under the Ancient and Historical Monuments and Archæological Sites and Remains (Declaration of National Importance) Act, 1951, the temple under reference, as there was no public worship at the premises, as was the case of many other monuments, when it was taken over for protection by the Union Department of Archæology in 1917.

(*b*) The Government have dropped further action in the matter.

SRI T. PURUSHOTHAM: Sir, are there not other temples notified under the Ancient and Historical Monuments Act such as the great temple at Tanjore, the Jayankondan temple in Jayankondasholavaram and the Kailasanathar temple at Kancheepuram and may I know why worship should be denied in this temple alone?

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM: As has been pointed out in my answer, unlike the other institutions taken over, in this particular institution, there was no worship when it was taken over. Further, I understand that there was no idol at all. I do not think it would serve any purpose to bring a new idol, install it and start worship again.

[13th February 1958

SRI V. CHAKKARAI CHETTY : What have the Government of India to do with this temple? Are they the guardians of all temples in the North and the South?

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : Sir, this structure has been taken over under the Ancient and Historical Monuments Act and, therefore, it is under the jurisdiction of the Government of India.

SRI T. PURUSHOTHAM : May I appeal to the Government and ask if they could not convey to the Central Government the feelings of a large section of the public in this matter and ask them to reconsider this question on such terms and conditions as they may deem fit, and even if it be necessary, by opening a separate entrance for the temple, barring the ancient monument referred to?

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : As the hon. Member is aware, the main object of worship in a Hindu temple is some idol and there is no idol at all here. Therefore, I am unable to understand the feelings of the people that the temple should be brought up again for worship.

SRI K. BALASUBRAMANYA AYYAR : Sir, may I say that there was an idol there? That is a matter of history and it was removed during the invasions. Therefore, may I suggest to the Government to consider whether on account of the historical circumstances we should not press on the Government of India to reconsider their decision which would have been done but for the fact that the Ministry there is manned by Muslims?

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : I may inform the hon. Member that there is also a mosque without worship within that structure. Apart from that, if the hon. Member could give me any information that that idol which was lost could be traced, I could now consider whether we could address the Government of India again.

SRI T. PURUSHOTHAM : Sir, have not the public come forward to make arrangements for reinstallation of the idol in this temple and would the Government at least as a last resort consider the deletion or withdrawal of the notification and exclude it—I mean the temple portion leading to the ancient monument portion, viz., the Kalyana Mahal said to be of great archæological importance—from the purview of the Ancient Monuments Act, so that the public may not be denied the elementary right of worship in this ancient temple, especially as the public have offered to reinstall the idol there and arrange for puja, etc.?

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : I shall repeat what I have stated earlier, namely, that if the idol which was there previously and which had been lost for a long time could be traced, we could consider the question.

13th February 1958]

SRI K. BALASUBRAMANYA AYYAR : May I point out that it is not necessary that the old idol should be traced and reinstalled? For example—the hon. Member Sri P. T. Rajan who is here will bear out my statement—in the famous temple at Somanath, the old idol of Somanath was lost and another idol was installed recently.

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : Somanath had a different history and that does not apply to this temple.

SRI T. PURUSHOTHAM : Even the proposal to trace the old idol is not a difficult proposition. But I am told that from the Agamic point of view, the idol which had been desecrated cannot be reinstalled and that, therefore, the public have come forward to install a new idol. May, I therefore, request the Hon. Minister most humbly to reconsider the matter and see what best could be done in view of the public feeling in the matter?

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : It may perhaps be possible to bring the temple under worship if the notification under the Ancient Monuments Act could be withdrawn, but I do not think it is right to have that notification withdrawn.

SRI MOHAMED RAZA KHAN : Will the Hon. Minister be pleased to convey the feelings of this House in the matter to the Government of India and also say that my learned colleague here has said that that order was passed because the Education Ministry was run by Muslims? I am very sorry about that sad remark and I would even request my hon. Friend to withdraw it.

SRI K. BALASUBRAMANYA AYYAR : There are some allegations which are proved.

THE HON. SRI M. BHAKTAVATSALAM : If the House expresses an opinion by bringing in a non-official resolution on a non-official day, certainly this Government would convey the opinions of this House to the Government of India.

Deputy Inspectors of Schools

* 12 *Q*.—SRI V. R. RANGANATHAN : Will the Hon. the Minister for Finance be pleased to state—

(*a*) the number of ranges of Deputy Inspectors of Schools in the State;

(*b*) the number of posts of Deputy Inspectors of Schools that remained vacant as on 1st July 1957; and

(*c*) the number of ranges that were in charge of Junior Inspectors?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : (*a*) 154, Sir.

(*b*) *Nine* posts of Deputy Inspectors of Schools remained vacant on 1st July 1957. These posts have since been filled in.

(*c*) 80 ranges of Deputy Inspectors of Schools are in charge of temporary promotees from the category of Junior Deputy Inspectors of Schools.

[13th February 1958

SRI V. R. RANGANATHAN : Is there any reason why so many posts are held by unqualified people?

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : Sir, all the graduates with training have been absorbed in the teaching institutions. Because we were unable to recruit fresh personnel for the purpose of filling these posts—as a matter of fact, our attempts to get graduates for filling these posts are proving futile—instead of depending upon raw graduates, we thought experienced Junior Deputy Inspectors could be promoted, and they are now holding these posts.

Creation of a Chair in the History of Indian Medicine

* 13 Q.—SRI T. PURUSHOTHAM : Will the Hon. the Minister for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether there is any proposal before the Government to institute a Chair in the History of Indian Medicine at the College of Integrated Medicine, Madras;

(b) whether the Government of India have sanctioned any grant for the purpose and, if so, the amount of such grant and the conditions attached thereto; and

(c) the stage at which the matter stands at present?

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU : (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) The Government of India have sanctioned a grant of Rs. 7,200, being three-fourths of the anticipated expenditure without attaching any conditions.

(c) The scheme is being implemented.

SRI T. PURUSHOTHAM : Sir, as a Special Officer, I believe, will be appointed to prepare this history, would the Government consider the appointment of a small committee of Tamil experts to assist the Special Officer, as most of the historical details relating to the Siddha system of medicine are to be found in ancient Tamil literature?

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU : Sir, the scheme involves the appointment of one Lecturer, First Grade, and three Pandits in the Siddha, Ayurveda and Unani systems and typists and all the other paraphernalia.

SRI T. PURUSHOTHAM : May I press for the consideration of the Hon. Minister that a Tamil Pandit who knows something of Tamil literature should be appointed?

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU : For this purpose, we require a different pandit—not a pandit in literature, but one in the systems of medicine—and we have provided for the three respective branches.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Questions are over.

[*Note.*—**An asterisk (*) at the commencement of a speech indicates revision by the Member.**]

II.—GOVERNMENT BUSINESS.

DISCUSSION ON THE GOVERNOR'S ADDRESS—*cont.*

MR. CHAIRMAN : Dr. A. Lakshmanaswami Mudaliar will now speak.

DR. A. LAKSHMANASWAMI MUDALIAR : Mr. Chairman, 3-10 p.m.
Sir, perhaps most of the Members are aware, but I should like to remind such of those Members as have walked into this House from the other Chamber, that there are only two occasions when this House has a certain amount of liberty to speak on subjects which are not strictly relevant to the particular propositions brought before it. The first occasion is the Address of the Governor and the second occasion is when the Budget is introduced by the Hon. the Finance Minister. On all other occasions the speeches are more or less guillotined by the restricted scope of the subject which is placed before this House. It is for this reason, Sir, that we claim your indulgence to cover a fairly wide tract in regard to many subjects on which we have no opportunity at all to speak.

Sir, as in the previous years, the Governor's Address is a very short, sweet document. As somebody remarked, it is so sweet indeed that we lose the sweetness of it very soon, because it is so very short. Some of us who are accustomed to the very sweets of this life would like to have it extended further. Anyway, that opinion has been expressed on more than one occasion without much success.

As I perused the Governor's Address, in about six to seven minutes, I could make out some of the most salient features depicted therein. The Address refers in various degrees to the problem of food supply, the progress made in the Second Five-Year Plan, the intensification of the Small Savings Movement, etc. Reference is made to the approach to the problem of the official language over which public opinion has been somewhat disturbed during the last few months not only in this part of India but in many other parts of India as well. We sometimes forget it. Having been recently in various parts of the country, I may say that it is not restricted to any particular part of the country.

Amongst the legislative measures that have been envisaged—almost every year this is the season for the introduction of Bills—may be mentioned the Bill to amend the Madras Prohibition Act, 1937. This is coming for the 'N'th time before this House. There is also a Bill, which is said to be a comprehensive Bill, again to amend the various sections of the Hindu Religious and Charitable Endowments Act, 1951, though some five years ago when the Hon. Dr. T. S. S. Rajan produced a voluminous, compendious Bill on Hindu Religious Endowments, he had exhausted all that he had to say on that matter. But we now see that there are some parts of the Bill that have to be modified. It is not my purpose to deal

[Dr. A. Lakshmanaswami Mudaliar] [13th February 1958

with the subject-matter of these Bills at present for the obvious reason that there will be an occasion later for this House to go into the details of the Bills.

Sir, I should like to refer to another aspect in regard to the Address. It has been said that a Bill to provide for the grant of a specific number of festival holidays including national holidays to industrial workers would be introduced. May I, on this occasion, invite the attention of the Government to the fact that no country in the world has so many Government holidays as our country has? Holidays are introduced without any previous notification. If an election is to be held, all colleges are closed. I know that occasionally we are blamed for not working for a certain number of days in a year. But the real difficulty is caused by the number of public holidays notified by the Government. If we do not implement the notification of the Government in our colleges, we shall certainly get into serious trouble with the students. Apart from this, Sir, when everybody is speaking of the Second Five-Year plan and the necessity for working it out, I do feel that the time has come both for the Centre and the States to review the position and see that the number of holidays is cut down—even ruthlessly cut down—though I know, as a matter of fact, that some of us do enjoy these holidays on the pretence of observing a certain religious ceremony. Even those who observe religious ceremonies do not necessarily require such holidays for them. I shall leave this matter at that.

I shall not deal with the amendments suggested to the various sections of the Hindu Religious and Charitable Endowments Act. But I would like to draw the attention of the House to a singular fact that has been emerging time and again before this House. Whenever the High Court or the Supreme Court holds a particular section to be invalid, at once legislation is introduced here to amend the Act so as to rectify the flaw in the light of the Court's observations without going into the full merits of the case. So much so, it has been more or less a common feature for any particular judgment of the Court to be warded off. Sometimes a piece of legislation is brought in even before the judgment has been finally expressed. I do not suggest that there may not be a necessity. I have not examined this particular Hindu Religious and Charitable Endowments Act. I shall do so when the Amending Bill comes up for discussion. But I say that it is certainly a matter for serious consideration. Whether the Amending Bill is in the light of the opinion expressed by the High Court or the Supreme Court, the Legislature should content itself for some more time to see how the Act works, unless it be that the matter is a very serious one concerning the welfare of the country. I think it is only by this means that we shall be showing the proper amount of respect to the higher judicial authorities in the State.

I next come to the question of food production. It will be necessary for me to deal with this subject in a more elaborate manner when the Budget comes up for discussion. But it is a

13th February 1958] [Dr. A. Lakshmanaswami Mudaliar]

matter of surprise and regret that after all these intensive methods of increasing food production, there is still shortage of food. We were told three years ago that we were not only self-sufficient, but that we were in a position to export foodgrains to other countries. We all felt that we could loosen our belts a little bit and that we could easily get more food for ourselves. But very soon true facts have shown that we are still facing a deficit in food. To-day I see that the amount involved in the import of food necessary to cover our shortage runs up to Rs. 300 crores. Sir, I make this serious suggestion. If the Central Government would only relieve themselves of this very serious task of supplying food to a country of 360 millions and to all the States, and confine themselves to certain large policies that are necessary and throw the responsibility entirely on the States themselves, as was done in the previous degenerate regime, I should like to give this assurance that the food problem will be solved by the different States themselves. What is happening to-day? I am afraid that many States, and certainly many people in the States, if not the Governments, have the happy feeling that if there is no food or if they imagine that there is not enough food, they can always make a grievance of it, go to the Centre and force them to see that food is made available. Not only that. I make this specific charge that in some States—not in Madras; I am speaking not to compliment the Treasury Benches, but because I know it is a fact—lands for raising food crops have been converted into those for raising cash crops, and thereby the extent of fields necessary for rice production or any other food production has been seriously curtailed. If you take an ærial view of some of the States that I have in mind—which, for obvious reasons, I shall not mention—you will see that large tracts have been converted into lands for raising sugarcane crop, oil seed crop, and various other forms of cash crops, which are certainly far more beneficial to the persons of those tracts. But the one thing that is clear and that has got to be remembered, so far as food supply is concerned, is that those States do not produce what they ought to produce. We ourselves in a certain measure are fully conscious of what is due to us. Some time ago, my esteemed friend Sri Kala Venkata Rao, who was the Minister for Agriculture and Revenue, introduced a Bill in the two Houses. Generally, these Bills get passed within about 15 minutes in the Assembly, because everybody knows the subject-matter of these Bills. Sometimes the Bills may get delayed in this House. But the effect of the Bill that was passed then was that no piece of agricultural land could be utilized for any other purpose than agriculture without the specific sanction of the Government. I should like to ask the Government whether this rule is being applied. As one goes from one corner to the other, as I did from Madras to Nagercoil, one sees many rice fields converted for various purposes other than agriculture. It is true that there is increase of population. We may require buidings. But there is a method of doing it. All that I say is that I do not dispute your right for such conversion, but I am asking the Government whether they have seen to it that that law is being observed; that is, whether their sanction had been specifically and

[Dr. A. Lakshmanaswami Mudaliar] [13th February 1958

in the terms of the legislation obtained before such conversion was made. Sir, I know the answer to this question, but I shall still await the other answer that may be forthcoming.

3-20 p.m.

Sir, it has become the habit for some States to be perpetually grumbling about the lack of supply even without trying to find out whether they are self-sufficient or what the whole position is. To that extent, a certain amount of discussion is started, vehement speeches are made by the legislators of some States and, in fact, various statements have been made which some of the Chief Ministers and Ministers have had to deny. We have been seeing in the Press reports about deaths due to starvation. The other day, Chief Minister, Katju, had to deny that there was any death due to starvation. I ask what this is due to. So long as you think that there will come some Moab from above and that you will get everything from the Central Government in regard to foodgrains, there is not much possibility of the States realising their responsibility, and the legislators at any rate, and the people realizing their own responsibilities. May I add this also? The tendency has been increasing for limiting ourselves to certain cereals like rice and wheat only. As one who has taken other cereals and relished them, I could say that there are ragi, cholam and cumbu. These were all the things that we were accustomed to in that civilized part of the country from which I came. There was nothing wrong with food production in those days although there used to be famine once in 30 years or 40 years. But, today, we are in a state of eternal famine. I, therefore, say that this question must be re-examined and fresh thought bestowed on it.

Now, I come to one of the chief features that have been referred to in the Governor's Address. Almost every speaker in this House has referred to it in some measure or other. This has become so much of a big problem that today we find the newspapers devoting a greater part of their columns to accounts, debates and speeches of leaders and mutual recrimination in regard to this question, viz., the language policy of the country. The Address has referred to what is known as the Memorandum on Official Language submitted by the Government of Madras. It is stated that there is every hope that 'the views embodied in the Memorandum will receive sympathetic consideration by the Government of India and the Parliament'. I ask, why 'sympathetic consideration'. We do not want sympathetic consideration, but we want just and equitable consideration. I do not want sympathy from anybody. I want justice. If justice is done by following a particular policy, I will be the first to accept that policy. No sympathy is required. We want sympathy for other purposes and not for a policy which is to determine the fate of the future generations yet unborn. It is just and equitable consideration that we want. (Hear, hear.) That is what people want. It is often said that there is a controversy about this language issue. I have heard criticisms in some papers here and elsewhere. I ask, 'Does this controversy start from one

13th February 1958] [Dr. A. Lakshmanaswami Mudaliar]

individual?' If there is a controversy, then there must be an opposing point of view, which develops into a controversy. I would very much wish that such controversies never occur. People have their own views. People express their views. There are opposing views. When the views are not couched in precise and generous terms, a controversy necessarily arises. Sir, let me deal with this subject which I though might not come up for discussion. When the Government of Madras invited some of the Members of the Legislature to ascertain their views before finalizing the Memorandum that they wanted to submit to the Government of India, it was known that that meeting was not open to the Press and rightly so. Many observations were made, discussions were full and frank. At the second meeting, some Members, at any rate, brought with them written notes on the draft report which they submitted at the meeting. It was stated by the Hon. the Education Minister and rightly so, when I raised the question whether dissenting minutes could be appended, that he was hoping that there would not be any such necessity and that it would be a report which would be more or less agreed to by all. I entirely agree that these statements are correct. It never occurred to me that there would be a public statement and consequently a public discussion on a matter which was entirely private. It is very difficult for us, who observe certain of these tenets in regard to private meetings, to enter into any controversy. I regret that any such controversy should have arisen in regard to the language issue and particularly in regard to the meeting which was entirely private. Having said that, let me also say this. After arriving at certain general conclusions and after seeing the Memorandum drawn up by the Government, I for one felt that there were certain limitations on us because the Memorandum was not a Memorandum of this Committee but it was a Memorandum that the Government were going to submit. Knowing and realising that the Government could possibly adopt that attitude and language which some of us might adopt—some of us may adopt language which may be considered intemperate and illogical—we realized, at any rate I realized, that we could not expect the Government to go as far as we might want. But, so far as the trend of the Memorandum was concerned, I do feel that possibly there was something to be said . . .

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM: May I remind the hon. the Leader of the Opposition that he corrected the temper of the Government's language? (Laughter.)

DR. A. LAKSHMANASWAMI MUDALIAR: In some cases I did that and in some other cases I inflamed that temper also. (Laughter.) Whatever it be, what I want to say is that it was the Government that assured us that that Memorandum would receive consideration and that it was the Government that told us that no change in the Constitution was necessary. I may be corrected if I am wrong. I was one of those who said and who even now feel that a change in the Constitution might be necessary for

[Dr. A. Lakshmanaswami Mudaliar] [13th February 1958

implementing the very proposals contained in the memorandum submitted by them to the Central Government. Sir, when responsible Ministers say . . .

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : I would like to correct that. At that time, I said that that was my point of view and if they should consider it the other way and take the attitude that the Constitution should be amended, I was prepared for that also. But, ultimately, we all came to the unanimous conclusion that it was not necessary and that the stand taken by the Government might be approved.

DR. A. LAKSHMANASWAMI MUDALIAR : Sir, I stand corrected if I was wrong; but I must confess that my impression was entirely different. I still hold the view that a change in the Constitution would clarify the position much better than any assurance from a Party, for the simple reason that Parliaments change, Ministers change and everybody changes.

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : All those aspects were considered then.

DR. A. LAKSHMANASWAMI MUDALIAR : Whatever it is, a change in the Constitution to the extent necessary would clarify the position.

SRI K. BALASUBRAMANYA AYYAR : Sir, the Hon. the Minister for Education stated at that conference that an amendment of the Constitution might not be necessary but that if all of us though that it was necessary, it might be done. We had a doubt whether in law Article 343 (3) was sufficient for our purpose. But, he said that it might be sufficient. That is why we—I mean myself at any rate—hesitated to press that point. Still, the memorandum did not say that we should not do it. That was the impression I got.

DR. A. LAKSHMANASWAMI MUDALIAR : I agree. I am only saying that there was a sort of mental reservation. When we are discussing a subject of this nature, when the Government say that they will have a particular thing done and when the Party in the local Legislature and the Party in the Central Legislature are the same, it is not right to push things far too much. Then, Sir, . . .

3-30 p.m. DR. A. SREENIVASAN : Do not you agree that so long as the amendment of the Constitution does not take place, it will be something like a Damocle's sword hanging over our head?

DR. A. LAKSHMANASWAMI MUDALIAR : I do not know. Nowadays, there are so many swords of Damocle and one more may not matter to a man like me. (Laughter.)

SRI K. BALASUBRAMANYA AYYAR : One such is our friend himself. (Laughter.)

13th February 1958]

DR. A. LAKSHMANASWAMI MUDALIAR: But one thing, I may say, in all fairness. There have been many things done which give room for some anxiety in the minds of the people. One is the pace at which this change is taking place. I do not want to refer to the part played by certain Ministries in the matter of forcing the pace of the change-over to Hindi in certain respects. Reference has been made by persons much better qualified than myself to these things, and I feel it but unfortunate that such things should have been done. The pace is forced even with regard to communications. The whole reason why there is so much of fear expressed and so much of concern shown is that even before 1965, attempts are being made in several ways to see that the pace is made quicker than what even the constitutional provision envisages. Let me refer to a few incidents in this connection. It is stated that this agitation, as they call it in this part of the country, has started because of a fear that a sufficient number of posts will not be available for the people of the non-Hindi areas in the Government of the country. I must say emphatically that this is not our fear. This is not a thing about which we feel any anxiety. I do feel that we need not worry ourselves about places in the Government departments. There are many other avenues open to us and we have resorted to these avenues in the past. I have sufficient confidence in our countrymen that they can rise to the occasion and get their bread and butter to the required extent. Perhaps they may miss the butter and get half bread. That does not matter. I do not want this question to be considered from that standpoint. But I do feel that what may be called an approach of vehemence does create problems. Let me give you one illustration. Only the other day, a supplementary question was put in Hindi in the Parliament in a long and involved sentence, because the Deputy Minister in charge was familiar more with Malayalam than with Hindi. It was the chivalry and courtesy of the Prime Minister that saved the situation, when he got up and stated, 'Although I do not understand this question, I will still try to reply to it'. And he replied to it and there was silence. Is this the atmosphere of cordiality wherein we could study and solve the problem of Hindi? Let us remember that unity does not depend upon one particular area. There must be 'give' and 'take' on both sides. Let me give you another instance. Reference has been made in the memorandum at page 12 (paragraph 41) to the need for translation. It is stated therein :—

"While endorsing these views as far as they go, the Government of Madras would invite attention to their suggestion that consideration should be given to the proposal that a system of simultaneous translation should be instituted in Parliament."

Sir, as long ago as 1952, I ventured to write to the former Speaker of the Parliament, Shri Mavlankar, inviting his attention to the fact that a system of simultaneous translation had been instituted for the purpose of transacting business in international assemblies including the *Palais Des Nations* at Geneva. I begged of him to consider these proposals so far as the Parliament was concerned.

[Dr. A. Lakshmanaswami Mudaliar] [13th February 1958

I even went to the extent of getting at persons in charge of the *Palais Des Nations*—my friend, the Hon. the Leader of the House knows what obtains there—and gave the Speaker a detailed note on the cost of instituting such a device. The cost came to about 300 Swiss francs, which might be about Rs. 3,50,000. Two months later, from the late Shri Mavlankar, I got a letter—I have not published it so far but now I feel I must bring it to the notice of the Government and the House—enumerating various difficulties in accepting my suggestion. The fundamental difficulty which he expressed was that it would delay the Members of Parliament learning Hindi and retard the development of Hindi. This was in the year 1952. If the State Government still feel that this plea for introducing simultaneous translation will be accepted, it is another matter. Having gone and seen things for myself, I do feel that we should, while certainly correcting and even admonishing such elements that make much of this language issue, tell the people who are interfering with the unity of the country by being overenthusiastic not to disturb national solidarity. But, unfortunately, they are disturbing it to-day which you and I are most anxious to maintain. Let there be no mistake about it. I have seen enough of the world. I have seen enough of the conflicts that have arisen over small points and ultimately disintegrated the countries for years and years to come. I realize that any such tendency, if not rooted out, will ultimately create more problems for us to solve. Then it will not be the responsibility of this State or any other State but the whole of India because it involves the temper and tempo of the people living not in this State or any other State but in the whole of India. Sir, I will give you another illustration. Recently, I had to go on a Commission of Enquiry to another part of the country. When one of the witnesses came, he saw me with a turban on—which unfortunately I never take off and which stamps me as one coming from a particularly uncivilized part of the country. (Laughter.) He said in Hindi, "I want to speak in Hindi. But this Gentleman will not understand it. What would be the effect?" to which I replied in Hindi, "You may please yourself. I can also understand some Hindi. So, that will not be your handicap."

THE HON. SRI R. VENKATARAMAN : You have passed the test; (Laughter).

DR. A. LAKSHMANASWAMI MUDALIAR : I wish I were in the Parliament speaking in Hindi. But the magic of it was in two minutes' time, he changed over to English of the best type and for the next fifteen minutes, he continued in English. I simply laughed over the matter. But all this need not be taken in such a simple manner. He expressed himself so well in English and tried to show his superiority in it. So, Sir, while expressing my views strongly that every attempt should be made to see that people in our own State do not create fissiparous tendencies, let me also say that the responsibility is no less on the people in other parts of the country to see that they supply proper decorum that is necessary for us.

13th February 1958] [Dr. A. Lakshmanaswami Mudaliar]

Let me give yet another instance. At the time when this language controversy was at its warmest—I say warmest not because there was no heat, there was a great deal of it—an incident occurred. A Deputy Minister from the Centre comes to the very centre of this controversy and says, 'English is the language of slaves and to speak in English is slavery.' Are you going to justify this? I would like to ask the Prime Minister whether he considers that a Deputy Minister is justified in coming to this State in particular at that particular moment and giving expression to his views on this question. Is he for solidarity of the country or is he for dividing this country and introducing fissiparous tendencies? I ask again : Is speaking in English the only evidence of slavery? When we send our students to English-speaking countries for further education, is that not an evidence of slavery? When we import scientific appliances and other things from English-speaking countries, is it a sort of overlordship and not slavery? Again, when we expect so much assistance from other English-speaking countries, is that one of those very vigorous mentalities that is responsible for it? I am not taking them seriously. People without a past and without a future do not count so far as I am concerned. That is the truth of it. But it is not clear if they take 3–40 p.m. these things so philosophically. I am referring to it this time for this purpose that the unity of the country can be maintained with the solid support of the people of this country. It is because of my anxiety that I expressed these convictions for the sake of promoting that very unity. Sir, what do we find to-day? For appointments in the Universities in the North, a knowledge of Hindi is essential. I don't mind it if they do not have us at all. Because we want all the talents that we get in our Universities. I am only sorry that they are taken away. But if advertisements are put in in this way, what does it mean? Is it the way in which you can make people realize that one need not worry if this controversy is over?

Sir, I was pained when I saw yesterday a report of a speech. The Speaker of the Parliament came and addressed a gathering in Madras. We were all under the impression that Speakers never spoke. You, as Chairman, have never given us the pleasure of speaking on all and sundry questions. There are already conventions that Speakers have established in the light of 300 years' experience in the House of Commons. If you study them, you will realize that no Speaker would speak on a matter of controversy. I shall ask you whether you will justify any Speaker making a statement on a controversial subject. I am sorry I have to say that. But unless we take courage in our hands and say what is wrong when it is wrong, democracy is bound to fail. And the first thing to practise in a democracy is the observance of conventions. Failure to observe the sound conventions well-established by law is the root cause of failure of democratic forms of Government. The Speaker of the Parliament has referred to many things. I do not want to read the whole speech. I am shocked that the Speaker of a Parliament should use the expression that he has used that if the

[Dr. A. Lakshmanaswami Mudaliar] [13th February 1958

past Chief Minister had not done certain things, the present Chief Minister would not have become "King-maker". Are the Members on the Treasury Bench quite satisfied that this speech should have been made by the Speaker or do they think that some action is necessary to invite the attention of the Prime Minister?

MR. CHAIRMAN : It can be ignored.

DR. A. LAKSHMANASWAMI MUDALIAR : You will never accept it. I know him (Speaker) well. What happened to him I can't say.

Sir, my last plea is this. We are passing through very critical times internationally and nationally. There can be no two opinions about it. Most of us do not perhaps realize the gravity of the situation in both respects. I am particularly agitated about the national situation in our own country. Things are happening in different parts of the country in different ways and you know the forces that have been let loose. It is up to us now who believe in democracy to maintain the democratic ideal and to put the people in a proper mode of conduct. I hope and trust, Sir, that this House will play its part well and worthily in preserving the ancient ideal of democracy and in furthering the cause of humanity in different parts of the country.

* SRI T. S. SANKARANARAYANA PILLAI : Mr. Chairman, Sir, in supporting the motion of thanks to the Governor so ably moved by my hon. Friend Sri A. Gajapathy Nayagar, I must say that the Address is brief and sweet. I shall not comment upon the Phillipic of the hon. Member Dr. Sreenivasan yesterday that it is a mere ritual which has lost all meaning, utility and glamour, and whether we shall not do better by abandoning this outmoded practice. I shall say a few words on the subject.

In the first place, I beg leave to be associated with the sentiments of grief and sorrow expressed by the hon. the Mover of this resolution on the demise of Sri A. J. John who was Governor of Madras for a short time. In the second place, I would like to extend to the new Governor, Shri Bishnuram Medhi, a cordial welcome. Coming as he does from distant Assam with a wide, rich and varied administrative and political experience as Chief Minister of Assam for a long time, I hope that he will be able to discharge his functions with great distinction and success.

Coming to the Address itself, I am glad that the Governor has rightly stressed the need to nourish and preserve the solidarity of the nation and to develop a sense of national unity which is of the utmost importance at this present juncture. In this connection, I am in full agreement with the hon. the Deputy Chairman of the Council in the great emphasis he laid upon this aspect of the matter though I do not share his panicky views in regard to the fissiparous tendencies now afoot and much in evidence.

13th February 1958] [Sri T. S. Sankaranarayana Pillai]

I feel that in a people's parliamentary democracy there is utmost freedom of speech and that this demand for Dravidastan is nothing more than local patriotism and parochialism running riot. If one leaves it at that, I am sure, it will evaporate in the fullness of time. I think, Sir, that one cannot be guillotined for saying things which may not be wholly proper and which may sometimes border upon insanity because freedom of speech is the cornerstone of a democratic set-up. 3-50 p.m.

The Governor has referred, in optimistic and encouraging terms, to certain important and burning topics of the day. We are glad that the Government have decided to accept the Pataskar Award which, I hope, would settle once and for all the sensational, emotional and acrimonious debate on the border issue. I think, Sir, that the border line has to be drawn somewhere in the interest of administrative convenience and if a few Telugu-speaking people find themselves under this arrangement on this side of the border and *vice versa*, it does not matter so long as both of them continue to be citizens of the Indian Union. I am convinced that the citizenship of the Indian Union is far more important and meaningful than the question where one happens to reside.

Secondly, the Governor has referred to the language issue and has deplored the controversy that has arisen over it, which has enabled the interested people to fish in troubled waters. It is gratifying to note that the Government have been able to evolve a compromise formula which, I think, is likely to solve this thorny problem. I am glad that in pursuance of the policy enunciated in the Official Language Act, Tamil has been introduced in about 2,000 offices in the State and I hope before long all the other offices will be able to transact their business in Tamil.

The Governor has then referred to the land reforms and said that the question of imposing ceilings on land holdings is now under the active consideration of the Government and that pending finalization of proposals in this behalf, legislation will be introduced to fix a provisional ceiling and to prohibit the acquisition of land above that ceiling. It is not known what that provisional ceiling is likely to be but in any case, I feel, Sir, that it would be better for all if the Government come out with their land policy in clear terms at an early date. Any enlightened scheme of land reforms in consonance with the socialistic pattern of society, I think, should have a three-fold object of eliminating glaring disparities in wealth, by bridging the gulf between the haves and the have-nots, of increasing food production and of ensuring full protection to the tiller in regard to the fruits of his labour. One hon. Member yesterday defined 'tiller' so as to include a mirasdar or a landlord.

Then, the Governor referred with obvious satisfaction to the prevalence of fair seasonal conditions in the State this year. Notwithstanding this rosy picture, I think, the prices of foodgrains and foodstuffs hover over levels beyond the reach of ordinary consumers, the poorer sections of the population and people with a small monthly income. This matter requires the earnest attention of the Government and we are told that the Second Five-Year Plan is

[Sri T. S. Sankaranarayana Pillai] [13th February 1958

making satisfactory progress, that the shortage of foreign exchange though it is there, is being met in a satisfactory manner and that the drive for small savings is gathering momentum and, I hope, it will augment our national resources.'

Sir, a number of legislative measures have been mentioned in the Address and they will come up before this House for discussion. But there is no indication of the financial policy of the Government which, I believe, will come up when the Budget is presented. With these words, Sir, I support the Motion of thanks and I thank you.

4 p.m. * SRI T. PURUSHOTHAM: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I rise to support the motion before the House, the main motion, and to oppose the amendment moved by the hon. Member opposite. (Interruption by Dr. V. K. John): (The Hon. Sri R. Venkataraman: It is a virtue of being consistent.) Sir, I welcome the new Governor. He has got rich administrative experience and his first utterances in this State have been quite encouraging. I believe that with the united efforts of the new Governor and our Ministers, this State would receive its due share of attention and help from the Centre, to achieve progress in all directions. Before I refer to some of the subjects dealt with in the Governor's Address, I should take this opportunity to welcome the new Members who have come to this House. (Cheers).

Some of the new Members here have been in the other House and with their rich experience in the Legislative Assembly, I am sure, they would be of much help to us in our deliberations. I should particularly like to welcome Sri P. T. Rajan, an ex-Minister, and a doughty leader of a one-time famous Party; he is now casabianca-like, a steadfact Partyman, the solitary leader and solitary follower of his Party. (Some hon. Members: Hear, hear). But still he would continue to be that. Whatever Party Sri Rajan may belong to, he commands the respect of all parties and we are particularly happy that circumstances have effected a transfer of this weighty leader from the other House to this House. (Dr. A. Sreenivasan: For good).

Sir, speaking of the new Members elected from the Teachers' and Local Authorities' Constituencies, I am glad that the system of personal voting has been introduced in the Legislative Council constituencies. Speaking as early as on the 8th July 1952, as hon. Members in this House would remember, I pointed out in a most emphatic way that there was scope for corruption in the system of postal voting and that in most cases secrecy of the ballot paper too was violated and so, I suggested that these drawbacks should be removed. I am glad that we are now having personal voting in all Legislative Council constituencies. But, Sir, other difficulties have arisen now, as the hon. Member Sri T. P. Srinivasavaradan would bear me out. Sufficient number of polling stations have not been arranged in these bye-elections and the graduates, teachers and local board members could not travel long distances to the polling stations. (Sri A. M. Allapichai: How far away were they?

13th February 1958] [Sri T. Purushotham]

(Sri T. P. Srinivasavaradan : About ten to twenty miles away). So, the result was that there was very poor voting and that not even 45 per cent of the voters in these educated people's constituencies voted in the recent bye-elections. (Interruption by Sri A. M. Allapichai). I am sorry, Sir, that I do not yield to the interruption of my learned Friend, the hon. the Deputy Chairman, because I have no statistics nor figures to furnish in answer to his questions. For, these elections were conducted only very recently and I have no figures to satisfy the hon. the Deputy Chairman's anxious queries. Correct voters' lists were not available and I hope, Sir, all this will be noted and rectified before the next elections.

Sir, I should also like to point out another important matter in this connection and that is, now that we have got an increased number of representatives for graduates, teachers and local authorities as Members in this House, there should be a more rational delimitation of constituencies. [Dr. A. Sreenivasan : Before 24th April 1958(?)]. Delimination of constituencies is necessary. (Interruuption.) Sir, I learn that there has not been any increase in the number of graduates' representatives : But the point I wish to stress is—I have also referred to this on an other occasion—that the graduates' and teachers' constituencies cover the entire State. I have, therefore, suggested and I would emphasise it for the consideration of the Government and through the State Government, the Election Commission, that the graduates' and teachers' constituencies should be spilt up into two or more constituencies each, so that there may not be four or five districts to be covered by the candidates in these constituencies. Sir, in the local authorities' constituencies we have as many as five members to represent three districts. It is not only a question of candidates wooing the electorates, but for the efficient functioning of parliamentary democracy, I feel, there must be smaller constituencies, so that the elected representatives might have more frequent opportunities to visit and cover the entire area of their respective constituencies. Sir, provision had been made in the States Reorganisation Act for delimitation of constituencies soon after the States were reorganised and pending the issue of revised delimitation orders, the elections have been held on the basis of the existing constituencies. Now that the Governor has, in his Address, told us that the Andhra border question too would be finally settled ere long and that Tiruttani would be added to our State, I would request the Government to take up the question of delimitation with regard to the Legislative Council constituencies and ensure a better arrangement with regard to the constituencies relating to graduates, teachers and local authorities. I should like that two or three Members should be elected from two or three districts for the local authorities and not five members for three districts. I hope, Sir, that the hon. the Leader of the House would consider even now the question of appointment of a Delimitation Committee so that that Committee might consider all aspects of the question and make due recommendations to the Election Commission for their consideration before the next elections.

[Sri T. Purushotham] [13th February 1958

Sir, this is one of the shortest Addresses of all Governors' Addresses that we have been so far treated to for some time. Crisp references to important matters have been made with much food for thought. Sir, I do not propose to dwell at length on the language question to which pointed references have been made and the hon. the Leader of the Opposition has given us a lucid picture of what occurred behind the scenes in the drafting of the memorandum that had been submitted by the Government of Madras. A copy of the memorandum has been placed before us. I should have welcomed it if there had been an opportunity for a fuller discussion of this language question in the Legislature so that the views of the Legislature could be communicated to the Parliamentary Committee that is at this problem now. The question of official language of the Indian Union has raised a bitter controversy and the hon. the Deputy Leader of the Opposition has placed before us very interesting theories for our consideration. He wanted that we should have one world, one language and one family. But who is to bell the cat in that direction? Whatever might have been his international outlook, I lack it, Sir. (Dr. V. K. John : Not international outlook, but human outlook.) Sir, he says it is not international outlook but human outlook. I am not able to swallow it. Whatever it is I leave it at that. On this question I was particularly attracted by the views expressed by the women's representatives who most emphatically held in a letter to the Press that English could not be the official language for ever. I entirely agree with
4-10 p.m. the views expressed by the two ex-Members of this House on behalf of the women of South India. I expressed so in another place. I hope that the memorandum that has been placed before us will receive, not sympathetic consideration, as has been stated here and to which objection has been taken by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition, but will receive due consideration. I must take this opportunity of congratulating our Ministers—the Minister for Finance and the Minister for Labour—on pressing the case of Tamil Nad in responsible quarters most emphatically. The memorandum, I feel, is not the final word. Sir, much water has since flowed under the bridge and over the bridge and I am sure certain other proposals placed in other responsible quarters should receive due consideration too. The compromise proposal of having Hindi in Hindi areas and English in non-Hindi areas requires serious consideration. But I do not see any reason why in non-Hindi areas English should be the official language of the Union. I would rather suggest that it should be the regional language, and let there be translators at Delhi and at the State headquarters to see that this business is carried on properly. I hope, as I suggested earlier, that at least a day would be allotted in this House for a fuller consideration of this problem so that we may express our views and see that they are sent up to the Parliamentary Committee. It is not possible during the discussion on the Governor's Address to consider at full length all the views expressed by hon. Members and the points that have been raised outside and in the Press.

13th February 1958] [Sri T. Purushotham]

I carefully listened to the learned speech of the hon. Member Sri K. Balasubramanya Ayyar regarding 'Kaiaeruvaramdars' and 'Mattuvaramdars' in Tiruchirappalli district. I am one with him and I agree with much of what he has said. I was at Tiruchirappalli when this particular Ordinance was issued, and it was pointed out to me that actual evictions of these categories of men had happened in that district for some time, and that would appear to have forced the Government to issue the Ordinance that has been now issued. Viewed from that angle, and when it has been made clear that there have actually been some cases of eviction of these people, the Government action would appear to be justified. But a Bill to regularise the provisions of the Ordinance has already been circulated, and we hope to have a full discussion on it in the near future.

As regards land reforms, Sir, the Government would bring in an interim legislation providing for a provisional ceiling and banning further acquisition of lands. I would plead that in these matters, a comprehensive legislation should be brought in straightway, as repeatedly assured by the Hon. the Revenue Minister in this House and in the other House. I am afraid that a provisional legislation may not help any one. Either party will not be satisfied. One party would continue to say that the Government are not sincere about it, and the other party would not stand to gain in any way. There is no question of acquisition of more lands. On the other hand, we hear that people are already selling away some of the excess lands in anticipation of this legislation that is impending. Because it is settled that we are going to have a ceiling fixed at some time or other, I would appeal to the Hon. Minister to avoid all complications in this matter and not to bring in a provisional ceiling, which is not, after all, going to serve the purpose in any way. The people are agitated about it and they may be told what the final picture of the land reform would be. I hope the Government will re-consider the need for the introduction of an interim legislation of this kind and see that the comprehensive legislation is put through as early as possible.

We are happy to be assured by the Governor that seasonal conditions have been fair, that crop prospects for the year are good, and that schemes for the supply of chemical fertilisers for the raising of green manure and the production of improved seeds in the State Seed Farms are being accelerated. In this connection, there is another problem that the Government would have to consider. There seems to be scarcity of agricultural labour. Landholders told me, Sir, when I visited some of the districts, that they could not secure sufficient agricultural labour and that they have converted, as has just now been pointed out by the Leader of the Opposition, their wet lands for garden produce cultivation. I have known of cases in which wet lands have been converted into garden lands in Chingleput and North Arcot districts. This point,

[Sri T. Purushotham] [13th February 1958

I feel, needs thorough investigation. What is this shortage of agricultural labour due to? Have these labourers left their villages in search of industrial employment? It is said that they cultivate their bit of land and are not interested in working for others. Perhaps the wages paid are not adequate. The agriculturists, on the other hand, feel that they are not able to meet the high cost of food production.

THE HON. SRI R. VENKATARAMAN : May I enquire in which district there is shortage of agricultural labour?

* SRI T. PURUSHOTHAM : I refer to Ponneri taluk in the Chingleput district. I have personally come across instances in which lands have not been cultivated. Landholders told me that there was a shortage of agricultural labour. I request the Hon. Minister to enquire into this, because this is a serious problem, and I am anxious that this should not affect our food production.

SRI T. P. SRINIVASAVARADAN : Is there any factory there?

* SRI T. PURUSHOTHAM : No. Madras is very near to them and they perhaps come away here. I hope that the Government would investigate this and take steps to improve the position.

It is gratifying to note in the Address that the programme of rural electrification is making commendable progress and that the target of 1,000 villages for the current year may be exceeded. But it does not do great credit because while we are expanding our rural electrification schemes, we are having electricity cuts at the same time. This problem should be re-assessed and the Government and the Electricity Board should see how soon the electricity cuts could be removed. The Hon. the Minister for Electricity, as hon. Members would remember, made a lengthy statement during the last sitting of the Council and assured us that, with the favourable monsoonic conditions ahead, the electricity cut would not be continued for long. May I appeal to the Hon. Minister and the Government to review the position and see how best we can arrange for the early removal of the cut in electricity supply?

My hon. Friend Sri Ponnuswamy Chettiar from Coimbatore has made a very useful suggestion for the production of electric power with medium scale schemes, particularly to benefit rural areas. From his experience of tour in Western countries, he said that apart from
4-20 major schemes, there was scope for smaller schemes to be taken up
p.m. for production of electrical energy. I think it should be possible to investigate such schemes to benefit particular local areas. We have not had such schemes so far in our State and I commend it to the Government for consideration. The hon. Member Sri Ponnuswamy Chettiar has said that it would be possible to take up medium scale schemes of power development in our State in specified localities and this needs investigation.

13th February 1958] [Sri T. Purushotham]

Before I close, may I invite your attention to the question of providing a new Chamber for the Legislative Council? I read in the papers, Sir, that you and the Hon. Speaker took the new Governor the other day round the Houses of Legislature. He is the head of the Legislative Assembly as well as the Legislative Council according to the Constitution. You would have shown him the "Governor's Box" in the Assembly Chamber. But, what about the Council Chamber? I wonder where we will seat him here. The Hon. Chairman of the Mysore Legislative Council Sri P. Seetharamiah is here watching the proceedings of the House. I wish to convey our welcome to him. I have met him in Mysore and invited him to visit our Council. It is so good of him to have come here to watch the proceedings of this House. It is a pity that we could not provide such distinguished visitors with better seats. Recently, there has been an increase in the number of Members of this House and we have to extend our seats to the very end near the Reporters' table. I wonder where we will seat the Governor if he should express a desire to pay a visit to our House as the Head of this House. Surely, he will not be interested in seeing the empty House. He will be interested in visiting the House when it is in session. Sir, you may remember that I wrote a letter to you some time back. In that letter, I have suggested that the new building proposed to be put up on the southern wing of the Secretariat building should be allotted for the new Council Chamber. I wrote to you, Sir, and also to the Hon. the Leader of the House and the Hon. the Minister in charge of State Legislature. The last gentleman Sri C. Subramaniam has written to me that he has taken up the matter with the P.W.D. authorities. To satisfy the opinion expressed by my revered friend Dr. Mahomed Usman. I have particularly suggested that the Council Chamber should be on the ground floor in the new House and that the Officers' Rooms, etc., may be provided in the first floor in the new Chamber proposed by me. I have also made an alternative proposal of providing a Governor's Room, verandahs, etc., above this House. That would mean that we will have to disturb the room now occupied by the Hon. Sri Manickavelu, our Revenue Minister. That is why I have suggested that I would favour the first proposal and not the alternative scheme of having rooms above this Chamber to provide for V.I.Ps. I would like to suggest that a conference may be held . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN : There is a conference tomorrow.

* SRI T. PURUSHOTHAM : What I want is that a conference of the Hon. Chairman, the Hon. the Leader of the House, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition, the Hon. the Minister in charge of Legislature, the Secretary to Government, P.W.D., and the Chief Engineer, P.W.D. may be convened so that the matter may be examined fully and the scheme pushed through and we may have a decent Council Chamber ere long. Thank you, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Mr. P. T. Rajan, you may now make your maiden speech. (Some hon. Members : Old maiden !)

[13th February 1958

* SRI P. T. RAJAN : Mr. Chairman, I should have thought, as befits a new-comer to this House, that I should keep silent and learn things before I venture to open my mouth. But, I cannot disobey you, Mr. Chairman, when you have asked me to speak. I do say with a certain amount of fear that I may not fit in with the new surroundings I find myself in. The hon. Member Mr. Purushotham, while welcoming new-comers to this Council, referred to me as a solitary member. . .

DR. A. SREENIVASAN : Left-handed compliment!

SRI T. PURUSHOTHAM : Not at all. Not from me.

* SRI P. T. RAJAN : He referred to me as a solitary member of a party that had ceased to exist. It might be that the organization has disappeared. But, its fundamental principles of eternal value still remain. They do not require an organization, nor do those principles require number. Such principles depend on their quality and not on numbers. While I listened to the very interesting and instructive speech of the hon. the Leader of the Opposition, I was moved by the very closing remark of his. He said that there was turmoil throughout the world and more so in this country and he gave a warning to the thinking men of every country to deal with the prevailing unfortunate situation. I am no student of Indian history, but I am told that Indian history repeats itself. To illustrate this, I will tell you what had happened before this country earned its freedom. There was foreign rule. Then, the Congress Party and its members, in order to bring down the foreigner on his knees and in order to wrest freedom from him, resorted to boycotts, hartals, civil disobedience movement and so on. It may be that as a result of that, we got our freedom. In the course of the struggle, the Police paid a great deal of attention and lathis were freely used. No doubt, the sacrifice of those people has brought them something. With the disappearance of the foreign Government, one should have thought that all those methods medieval in character would have disappeared. Unfortunately, we see those very methods being adopted by those who are opposed to the Government. If you ask them, they say, " Well, we are merely following in the footsteps of the Congressmen ". Whatever be the Government, the Government in office have to maintain law and order mainly with the help of the Police.

4-30 p.m. It might be that if some other Party occupies the Treasury Bench, the Congress Party resorts to its old devices. One redeeming feature, if that can be called a redeeming feature, is that the Police, in the use of their lathis, were very impartial. (laughter) and they should be congratulated upon it. Theirs was to obey and not to question. I was once told by an officer of the Madras Regiment stationed near Delhi in those troublous days of 1947 that the Delhi Police would not obey the command of their officers, that Muhammadans would not shoot Muhammadans, that the Hindus would not shoot the Hindus, and that, therefore, the Madras Regiment was eventually called in to take charge of law and order since the personnel of the Army would obey the

13th February 1958] [Sri P. T. Rajan]

command of its officers. Thanks to the sense of discipline of the Army, law and order was restored there. Likewise, thanks to the discipline of the Madras Police, law and order was maintained in Madras. But how long are we going to depend upon the Police for maintenance of law and order? The good sense of the people should prevail. The Police must be used only as a last resort. Unfortunately, we in this country are playing political ' hide and seek '. I do hope that this kind of political game will disappear and make room for public opinion to assert itself. As a result of this political strife, communal differences have raised their ugly heads. During the last year or so, we saw different communities—Thevars, Nadars, Harijans and last but not least Brahmins—trying to organize themselves. Brahmin friends feel called upon to organize themselves to defend themselves; instead of the Government giving protection, these communities believe that they should organize to defend themselves and carry on a tribal warfare, if need be. We have been reduced to that unfortunate position. As I said, in a civilized country, it is public opinion that should count. It is the action of the leaders that should count. Take, for instance, the incidents known as the Ramanathapuram incidents. These could have been quite easily given a quietus if the Chief Minister of the State, as the leader of public opinion, had visited the place. He is no doubt a Congressman. That is purely an accident. But so long as he is the leader of the people, in his capacity as Chief Minister, it is his duty to get into touch with the people, ask them and persuade them, to help him in maintaining law and order. Unfortunately, the Ministry depended a good deal on the effectiveness of the Police force in handling the situation. The Chief Minister, I believe, during the devastation caused by floods a few years ago, went to the affected areas, got into water, into the ditches and into very many places which would normally have been avoided by people like us, in order to take help to those people who were marooned and thereby came to command the confidence of the people, the respect of the people. Similarly, in this case, he might have taken upon himself the responsibililty to visit Ramanathapuram, unaided by his Colleagues, unaided by other Party leaders and unaided by the Police even. I am quite sure he would have succeeded in persuading the people to help him in maintaining concord and harmony in the State. It is not with a view to condemning anybody that I am referring to this matter. Sometimes, it is felt by some people that the Chief Minister is the property of the Congress Party. As a leader of that party, he is the property of that Party. As Chief Minister of the State, he owes a duty to the people of the State and they also in their turn owe a duty to him. After all, the Government are there to see that everybody in the State gets a just deal. I believe it is not too late for the Chief Minister to appeal to the people by going down to the districts in the Tamil area for their co-operation. If he asks for it, he will get it, because I have faith in my people, in the Tamilians. They will do what is just and what is correct. After the Ramanathapuram incident, more ugly events took place. The Prime Minister paid a visit to Tiruchirappalli. The Prime Minister occasionally uses a language which he

does not really mean but which upsets the people. When he visited Madras shortly thereafter, there was a move by some Party to welcome him with black flags and to arrange for that welcome. That Party which happens to be in the Opposition in the Lower House decided to call for a public meeting. That public meeting was not permitted to be held by the Police. If here again the Chief Minister felt that the demonstration should not take place, he should have approached the leaders of the Opposition Parties
4-40 p.m. and settled matters. This is not a question of approaching other Parties and other Party leaders for a personal favour. If you are going to approach them for the purpose of maintaining harmony and concord in the State, you should even stoop to conquer. This is my humble opinion. If the Chief Minister had done that, I am quite sure, the other Party leaders would have expressed their resentment at the words used by the Prime Minister of India and stopped there. But he did not do so. The Government left it to the Police and the Police refused to give permission. In this connection, Sir, I would like to know whether these refusals and all other functions which pertain to the Police are left to the Police themselves or dictated from the Government level. Are the Police responsible for them?

THE HON. SRI R. VENKATARAMAN : Government take the responsibility for their actions.

* SRI P. T. RAJAN : I know, Sir, the Government are responsible for every act of their subordinates. I do know that. This is not a new thing to me. I know this fully well for I have knowledge of this. I had something to do with the administration of this State at a time when the foreigner was the Ruler and when all your leading and important men were opposed to it and carried on a crusade against the Government of the day. I know Government are normally responsible for acts of departments. But each department is responsible for certain functions. The Government do not dictate to them. I understand, Sir, that in this connection, the Government said, "Don't give permission". This is what I am inclined to believe, subject to correction. If the Government are going to direct the activities of the Police from Fort St. George, there is no need for any superior Police officer. We can have a number of well-trained sergeants to carry out the orders of the Government. But if, on the other hand, the Police are made responsible for law and order, it is their business to give permission for all parties, for all citizens to express their views and if these citizens misbehave, the Police have got the weapons to put them down. Simply because you anticipated that your opponents were going to do something, which the Government did not like, you asked the Police to stop it.

THE HON. SRI R. VENKATARAMAN : As I already said, the Government are responsible for the action of their subordinates. But the Government do not give directions. Departmental Heads are responsible to the Government. I do not think it is etiquette to disclose which particular authority took which particular action.

13th February 1958]

DR. V. K. JOHN : The rules enunciated by the Leader of the House are different from those obtaining in Delhi in matters like this.

THE HON. SRI R. VENKATARAMAN : I may again say, Sir, that the Government are responsible for all the acts of their servants and subordinates.

* SRI P. T. RAJAN : What I am saying is that the Government have given directions or instructions to their subordinates.

THE HON. SRI R. VENKATARAMAN : The Government are responsible for all the actions of their subordinates.

* SRI P. T. RAJAN : I don't mind if my hon. Friend does not wish to understand my statement. I am saying what I feel should be done. If I am wrong, the public is there to judge. The Constitution gives the right to the individual citizen to express his views. If one man misbehaves, nothing will happen. The Police are there to deal with him. That is my point. If you think I am wrong, if you do not accept my statement, the public is there to decide. If that particular meeting had been allowed to be held that day and acts of rowdyism occurred, you could have held the leaders morally responsible for such acts.

DR. V. K. JOHN : Are you speaking on the adjournment motion?

* SRI P. T. RAJAN : I am only saying that whether the decision rested with the Police or with the Government, the situation that day was so ugly that it spoilt the fair name of Madras. Buses were burnt for the first time in the City of Madras. Some of us—unfortunate persons—who took part neither in the welcome nor otherwise had the taste of tear gas in the club. And the Prime Minister, both on his way from the airport and also on his way to the Science Congress, was subjected not only to the waving of black flags but also to missiles being thrown at him. It is an incident that nobody can be proud of, much less the Tamilians. After all, this State has been known for its tolerance and it is open to the Prime Minister—from the Prime Minister down to the lowest man—to express his views freely. If you dislike his views, you can ignore them. But, I condemned resort to violence thirty years ago and I condemn it today also. It is alien to the democratic ideal. I condemn it in very strong terms.

In the United States of America they had a hunt for the Communists and called Communist activities un-American. Activities of such persons during the Prime Minister's visit to Madras might be styled as un-Tamilian with greater justification. I appeal from this House, Sir, to the citizens of Tamil Nad to maintain that great reputation and fair name which it has enjoyed for so many years. After all, occasionally political differences might flare up but if those political differences are to bring disgrace to the very culture and honour of Tamil Nad, it is high time that the people of Tamil Nad took the law into their own hands and prevented it and not depended upon the Police or the Government. 4-50 p.m.

[13th February 1958

DR. V. K. JOHN : May I enquire whether the hon. Member places the responsibility on the Government for the lawlessness?

* SRI P. T. RAJAN : If what I have stated has not made my position clear, I do not think that any further remarks on my part will do it.

Is there any time-limit, Sir?

MR. CHAIRMAN : Not for the hon. Member who is making a maiden speech. He can take his own time.

* SRI P. T. RAJAN : Thank you, Sir.

The language issue was referred to by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition. What should be the official language is a question that is agitating the minds of the people throughout India. I quite agree that it is not an easy question. It is a very difficult question. But if any opposition by a group of people, who feel that Hindi should not be the official language, is going to be interpreted in the same sense that they are not for the unity of the country, that is a thing which cannot be tolerated. We cannot accept it lying down. Language is one thing and the unity of the country is another. First things should come first. Do these gentlemen want the unity of the country or do they want the language? If they want the unity of the country, every other item must make room for the unity of the country. Simply because a set of people feel that there is opposition to Hindi, it is wrong to say that the opposition is due to the fact that they are against the unity of the Indian Union. It is they that put the idea of further division of the country. In the year of grace 1947, it was the very same people that divided India into two through the pan-Hindi or Hindu Movement. It has been the dream of many conquerors and it has been the dream of Indians from time immemorial that there should be one India, one United India. Who was responsible for the division of India into two? Not those unfortunate people from the South. At that time, the Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam did not exist. These very same people were responsible for the division of the country then and the warning given by an eminent statesman was ignored. They are again trying to create further trouble and further division of the country. A warning is given by that same statesman now and if they are not going to take note of that and if they persist in their own way, they must be held responsible for the consequences and not the Southerners. They are obsessed with one idea of the supremacy of Hindi to indicate that the people living in the North are the masters of the country. That idea no man can accept, no Tamilian for that matter can accept. We do not want to change from one slavery to another, from one master to another. We in this State are willing to co-operate with the other States in maintaining the unity of that portion which can be called India now. But if in the name of that unity these gentlemen are going to interfere with the normal activities and lives of the people of other States, all that I can say is that they cannot get away with that.

13th February 1958] [Sri P. T. Rajan]

Then, Sir, this question of Dravidastan and Tamil Nad is the slogan for which the Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam is made responsible. I hold no brief for anybody. It was in the year 1917 that the late lamented Sir Theagaraja Chettiar and Dr. Nair started their Party called the South Indian Liberal Federation. The Federation was to consist of all Southern States, lying south of the Vindhyas. It would not have come into conflict with the Centre. It was felt that taking the habits, manners and customs into consideration, it would be a natural Federation if these States were to come together. Rightly or wrongly, those States which were expected to form part of the Federation went out, leaving only Tamil Nad. What is left of that Federation is Tamil Nad now. Of course, the hon. Members sitting on the Treasury Bench would not say ' Tamil Nad ' but they will say ' Madras State '. It does not matter whether it is called Madras State or Tamil Nad. Sir, the Tamilians have a history of their own, traditions of their own and a culture of their own. Bearing all these in mind, we are willing to co-operate with the other Parties in maintaining the stability of that portion of India which is left to us now. If those people who are obsessed with, as I said, one idea of their importance make it impossible for us to co-operate with them, they will be guilty of anything that takes place as a result of their persistence.

About the capacity of the Tamilians or Tamil Nad to look after 5 p.m.
their business, I will take some other opportunity to offer my remarks. But I can only say this to those gentlemen including the Prime Minister of India that we are not out to destroy the Indian unity. Speaking as I do with a full sense of responsibility, I may say that all the Parties in the Madras State are for a United India. Some of the people may perhaps, to please the powers-that-be, do something contrary to what we have in view. If the bogey, that Indian unity is in danger, is raised by pro-Hindi people because Hindi is not accepted as official language by the people in the South, it won't be listened to by anybody in Tamil Nad. That is all I can say.

Lastly, Sir, I want to make a reference to the new Governor. It looks as if there are some people who do not welcome him. Politically, perhaps there may be a feeling that one of the citizens of Tamil Nad should be made Governor. If a Tamilian is made Governor of Madras, we will welcome him, but even if an Indian from another State is made Governor, we must welcome him. Tamilians have welcomed every outsider. (Dr. A. Sreenivasan : Even the British !) Yes, even the British. Anyway, it is better to have an outsider than a local man, for a local man might have his own likes and dislikes, his own prejudices, affiliations, etc. Therefore, it is far better that an outsider is posted as Governor. Likewise, I should like Tamilians, eminent Tamilians, to be posted as Governors of other States. But if they are going to keep Tamilians out of this honour consistently and if they persist in doing that, I should object to it.

[Sri P. T. Rajan] [13th February 1958

I was told, Sir, that the Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam did not, to indicate their protest, take part in the joint sitting of the Assembly and the Council. Politically they have got a right, because in this modern democratic set-up in India, absenting oneself and walk-outs from the Legislature have become the fashion of the day and they have followed it. This is the present-day practice and it is in vogue everywhere. But I am sorry to learn that they did not attend the party given by the Governor. That was purely a social function and it should not have been mixed up with political functions. I would request my friends in that Party to differentiate between politics and everyday social activities and I hope they will reconsider their decision and give up boycotting Governor's functions. (A voice : Social functions), especially social functions. I hope they will not take this as an affront to them or gratuitous advice to them, but I feel that all Parties should rise above Party differences, political differences and in social functions we must all come together. It is the lack of understanding of things in their proper perspective that has brought about trouble in this country.

Sir, I mentioned about the Hon. the Chief Minister and his lack of constant touch with other Party leaders. If he had only such touch, people would understand each other better and I request him to do that, for such an association of the Chief Minister will have its own weight and effect. But one thing to which I should like to take exception is this. Sir, I am a man of the old generation, a generation that is past (A voice : Living in the present) yes, living in the present—partly dead and partly alive. The hon. the Leader of the Opposition and I believe in traditions and conventions. My conception of a Governor is that he is the Head of the State, that he receives people from other States and that he acts as host for us, officially. But nowadays, whenever a Minister from the Centre or other States comes, the Governor goes to the airport to receive him. When the Prime Minister comes, he goes there with a garland. That is not a function for which you have a Governor. If you want to change his functions or break away from the traditions, you can changs the nomenclature of the Governor. Call him an Agent of the Government of India; I have no objection. (A voice : He is no more 'His Excellency') Well, that does not make much difference. Formerly, we used to style the Ministers as Honourable Ministers; now the hon. Members on the Treasury Benches do not want that and they must tell us why. What I am saying is that it is not a question of calling him His Excellency the Governor. He is the Head of the State and he holds the respect, prestige and dignity of the State. If he is the Agent of the Government of India, let him dance attendance on anybody who comes from anywhere. It will not matter and it will make no difference to me then. Sir, when Sir George Stanley was Governor, his brother, Lord Derby, a household name in Britain, came here. As Governor, he did not go and receive even his brother at the railway station, because the Governor could only receive persons higher in status than himself officially. As I said, being men of the past generation, we have got certain ideas

13th February 1958] [Sri P. T. Rajan]

associated with certain persons and certain persons with certain ideas and naturally when I think of the Governor, I expect him to do certain things and not to do certain other things. (Sri T. Purushotham : He is a democratic Governor !) Then in a democracy, have no Governor; there is no need for a Governor. I fear the interruptions will only help me—let me complete my theory and idea and not be interrupted—and instead of demolishing my theory, they will only help me to establish my case. [Dr. A. Sreenivasan : That was his (Mr. Purushotham's) intention !]. Thank you very much then. (Sri T. Purushotham : No, no.)

Lastly, Sir, when unexpectedly the vacancy in Governorship had to be filled by the Government of India, in Bombay in the first instance and in Madras secondly, the Chief Justices of the respective States were appointed as Governors. (Sri T. Purushotham : That is the Constitutional provision.) I don't know and I am not bothered about it. (The Hon. Sri R. Venkataraman : Perhaps, the hon. Member doubts my ability to reply to the debate !) (Sri T. Purushotham : No, no, Sir.) Now, Sir, the Chief Justice is the supreme head of the judiciary and the judiciary is supported to be above politics, especially controversial politics. That has been the tradition, the British tradition. Now, you have upset the apple-cart. You make him Governor and you drag him into the political arena. If you do that once and for all, well and good. But he is in politics today and again he is sent back to the judiciary. I am afraid this would not be conducive to the efficient working of the judiciary. If there is one department which has escaped the influence of political parties, it is the judiciary. Why should the Government take this way? This is a matter for the President of the Indian Republic to consider. If a humble person like myself can convey in my own humble way, especially through this House, I would like to request the President to consider whether any Chief Justice or any Judge of the High Court should be appointed as Governor. If they are appointing him as Governor, let the appointment be made once and for all. Because, as my friend, the Leader of the Opposition said, if we want democracy to flourish in this country, we will have to maintain traditions. We have got to call a halt if anybody does wrong. We have got to criticise so that democracy may be saved from those who are not fit to run democracy. In my humble way, I would like to request the President of the Indian Republic to see that in filling up vacancies, even though they are of a short period, he does not bring in Judges from any Court. It does not matter whether it is the Madras High Court or the Bombay High Court or even the Supreme Court. In order to maintain the prestige of the judiciary, we should keep them away from politics. That is my humble request to the President of the Indian Republic. It may be that the Constitution says something. But we have been accustomed to the working of democracy here even from its inception in a particular way. Therefore, we would like to see that these traditions are maintained, because those traditions have been held as the right and correct traditions.

5-10 p.m.

[Sri P. T. Rajan] [13th February 1958

Sir, in my maiden speech I have taken more time than I should have, through your courtesy and kindness and the courtesy of my colleagues. Thank you very much, Sir. (Cheers).

* THE HON. SRI R. VENKATARAMAN : Mr. Chairman, I am grateful to the hon. Members for the keen interest they took in the debate and for the very valuable suggestions which they have put forward in their speeches. About 30 Members have taken part in this debate, of whom about six have made maiden speeches, including the none too maidenly speech of my esteemed friend Sri P. T. Rajan. Judging from the performance of the Members who have made their maiden speeches in this House, I think we have every reason to congratulate ourselves on the fact that this House has added to its debating talent. The motion of thanks was very ably moved by my esteemed Friend Sri Gajapathy Nayagar who dealt with the policies of the Government with a judicial balance. In fact, the felicity with which he expressed himself in Tamil was a revelation to us. (Hear, hear.)

Sir, I shall broadly classify the suggestions, opinions and ideas expressed in the course of the debate, into four main heads, and then proceed to deal with some other points not covered by these four headings. Most of the Members dealt with the language question, the question of land reforms, law and order situation, and also the possible disruption of the country. Of course, there were other speeches also. Particularly an eloquent plea on behalf of the teachers was made by my esteemed Friend Sri Srinivasavaradan as well as by the new Member Sri Ramasamy Gounder and a few others. The hon. Member Sri Ponnuswamy Chettiar dealt with the handloom problem. I shall briefly deal with these at the end of my speech.

So far as the official language question is concerned, I am very grateful to this House for the general support which it has given to the memorandum prepared by the Madras Government for submission to the Parliamentary Committee. I do not want to enter into any controversy over what happened at the meetings at which the memorandum was discussed. I agree with the hon. the Leader of the Opposition that it is really unfortunate that what was considered to be a heart-to-heart, private consultation should have been brought into the market and that charges and counter-charges should have been levelled. But when one party thinks it proper to go to the people and place certain facts, it becomes necessary for the Government to place the other point of view also. Otherwise, they are liable to be mistaken as having acquiesced in the representations made by certain sections.

Sir, so far as the language question is concerned, we have to look at it from two points of view. What is to be the language for the day-to-day transactions and inter-State relationship, commerce, trade and industry in this country? The second aspect is, what should be the official language, the language used for the purpose of official communication between the Centre and the States and between the States *inter se*. There has been confusion in the minds of the people who discussed this question, and who

13th February 1958] [Sri R. Venkataraman]

took one aspect of the question and used it as an argument in support of the other aspect. For instance, if any one had to make a pilgrimage towards the North (to visit Kasi or some other place), one has to have a smattering knowledge of Hindi to be able to travel in all those places. But that is no argument certainly for saying that that should be the official language of the country. Sir, the Government of Madras clearly saw the distinction between the common language for the people of India for their commercial transactions and the official language in which transactions between the States and the Centre should be carried on. When the Constitution was framed, it was felt that by the year 1965, Hindi could become the official language of the Indian Union, that is to say, the language in which the States would be able to correspond with the Centre and the Centre would be able to make itself understood in the States. In their enthusiasm they even thought that the Hindi language would have developed itself to the extent of being able to be used as the language in the subordinate courts, offices, administration, and so on. But, the experience in the last few years has shown that language does not develop so fast or so quick. The experience in the last few years has also shown that the Hindi language does lack precision which is so essential for inter-State communication. The same word has to carry the same meaning all over the country and also convey the same meaning to all the people. Precision is the most important aspect of official language. This aspect has been realized whether it was at the instance of people from Madras who represented it very strongly or otherwise. I am glad to say that this aspect has now been fully realized.

It is not perhaps germane to this debate to refer to the proceed- 5-20 p.m.
ings of a political organization. But, in the present context, when that political organization happens to be the governing party in the country, references to it, I trust, may be permitted. When this question was discussed at the annual Party convention at Gauhati, it was brought to the notice of all the people of India that unless English continued to be the official language along with Hindi beyond 1965 envisaged in the Constitution, it would be impossible for the States in South India to carry on proper correspondence with the Central Government. I am glad to say that the Party saw the force of the representations and agreed to bring forward legislation to continue the use of English for official purposes even after 1965. Sir, there are some leaders in Madras who twit the Madras Government by saying, ' What have these representatives from Tamil Nad done in the annual Party convention at Gauhati? They have merely reproduced clause (3) of Article 343 of the Constitution. With very great respect to those people, I wish to submit that clause (3) of Article 343 of the Constitution is merely permissive. It states that Parliament may by law provide for the continued use of English even after the period of 1965. But, what the Party has undertaken at its convention is to bring forward legislation to continue the use of English for official purposes beyond 1965. I wish to ask this House whether it is not a definite advance on the position contemplated by Article 343. Surely, when the Party in power says that it realizes the need for the

[Sri R. Venkataraman] [13th February 1958

continued use of English beyond the target date fixed in the Constitution and that for that purpose they will bring forward legislation, I believe, Sir, they have taken a very great step forward in meeting the desires of the people of this State.

Dr. V. K. JOHN : I take it that it would not have been possible but for the representations made.

* The Hon. Sri R. VENKATARAMAN : I do not want to compliment myself. I leave it to others to say that. Sir, the new suggestion that has emanated from one of our revered leaders, viz., that those States which want to transact business with the Centre in Hindi may do so and that those States which want to use English may be allowed to do so, in my humble opinion, approximates to the Government memorandum. Provision for the continued use of English after 1965 enables those States to use English as the language of communication with the Centre for official purposes. So, the option is contained therein. If the other States wish to communicate with the Centre in Hindi, it is not proper that we should prevent them from using the language which they want. In our anxiety to see that we are not prejudiced, we should also endeavour to see that the other States are not prejudiced. Once English ceases to be the medium of instruction, the knowledge of English among the population will go down and I am sure educationists will bear me out. After some time if they are not able to express themselves freely and effectively in English, then it would be time to see what they should do. So far as the present position is concerned, the situation as it now emerges after the Party convention is one in which there is perfect freedom for the States to use English as well as Hindi as they like.

Sir, in 1950–51, when I happened to be in Parliament, I mooted the same suggestion which the hon. the Leader of the Opposition just now made, viz., provision for simultaneous translation in Parliament. If we adopt two languages as official languages, translations become easy. In the International Conferences translations are simultaneously given for five different languages. If we have only two languages, it should not be very difficult to provide for such translation. I am quite sure that the same suggestion very strongly put forward before this House by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition will be heard in parliamentary circles. I can only reinforce what he has stated.

5 30 p.m. I shall now proceed to the next subject, viz., land reforms. A number of speakers have referred to it. Particularly, the hon. Member Dr. Sreenivasan flung a jibe at the Government and said that it was for the purpose of vote-catching that the Government were bringing forward these reforms. Sir, the question of land reforms was placed in the forefront of the Congress Party in its earlier resolutions. In its election manifesto, it stated that land reforms would be undertaken. May I, in all humility, ask the hon. Member Dr. Sreenivasan and men of his way of thinking whether refusal to implement a mandate which was given to the Party would

13th February 1958] [Sri R. Venkataraman].

not amount to betrayal? Whether you call it vote-catching tactics or a mandate from the people, it is clear that the people of this State did want it.

Dr. A. Sreenivasan : Excuse me, Sir. The Congress secured only 45 per cent of the total number of votes polled. More than 55 per cent of the people were against it.

* The Hon. Sri R. Venkataraman : This is a very, very old and stale argument. In any democracy, the Parties which do not have a common programme amongst themselves cannot plead that the votes which were cast for several Parties in opposition represent votes against the Party in power. I shall not enter into that now. I merely want to say that this is part of the policy of effecting social justice to provide for fixity of tenure, fair rent and facilities for the tiller. Now, in order to provide for these, the Planning Commission itself felt that a ceiling should be fixed and that the surplus should be distributed so as to ensure that a larger population was able to get enough to live on. In this proposed piece of legislation, attempt is not being made immediately to introduce a ceiling in respect of the existing holdings. It is proposed only to prevent future acquisitions beyond a particular limit as a preliminary to future legislation in this regard.

Dr. V. K. John : May I ask if there is any danger of people increasing their acreage hereafter?

* The Hon. Sri R. Venkataraman : That is an argument which I was about to use. If, as Dr. John and others have said, there are no persons who would come forward to purchase property and land, why should there be any objection to ceiling on future acquisitions? In the course of making his point, the hon. the Deputy Leader of the Opposition threw a few caustic comments. He said that the Government had already destroyed the private sector in industry and that they were now seeking to destroy the private sector in agriculture. Well, this was mentioned by him in a very general way. I am not sure whether he meant that the Madras Government had destroyed the private sector in industry. If he did, then I would fain ask him to give an instance.

Dr. A. Sreenivasan : Part put for the whole.

* The Hon. Sri R. Venkataraman : Apart from the Government Transport and some mineral concern which has come from the Travancore-Cochin State to us, can he point out one instance where private enterprise has been interfered with? In fact, it has always been my complaint that private enterprise in this State is not enterprising enough and that it has not come forward to take advantage of the facilities which are given. Though they are poor, still they are available. Therefore, I do not want to leave that criticism unanswered lest it should create a misapprehension in the minds of industrialists, who are likely to come forward to engage themselves in industrial activity in the State, that they stand the danger of nationalisation.

[13th February 1958

DR. V. K. JOHN : Does not nationalisation by the Centre affect the Madras State?

* THE HON. SRI R. VENKATARAMAN : Nationalisation by the Centre is also confined to very limited fields. It is only in those fields where private enterprise is not in a position to find the capital for huge projects, that nationalisation takes place. I do not think there is enough capital or enterprise to build up a plant like that in Rourekela or Durgapur which cost 100 crores of rupees each.

Then, there was another fear expressed by the hon. Member Sri Balasubramanya Ayyar that by fixation of this ceiling food production would be affected. He said that land would be fragmented and that production would go down. On the other hand, Sir, intensive cultivation is possible only in small holdings. By intensive cultivation, countries like Japan have shown how much they could improve or increase production, without having to have recourse to mechanised farming. Therefore, even that fear is not well-founded, and the apprehension that fixing of a ceiling on land holdings would retard agricultural production has not been borne out by experience in other countries.

May I now go to the third point, viz., the law and order situation in the City? It is indeed very sad that the fair name of Madras for its forbearance as well as tolerance even during those troublous days of communal hatred, has been marred in recent months. I want to make it clear that the Government are as unhappy about it as any decent citizen of this State would be. It is only when the blame is sought to be laid at the door of the Government that we have to place the facts and circumstances before the people and call for a judgment on the issue. In the first place, it is not true that a ban was imposed for the purpose of preventing a meeting to be held by the Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam. Several months back, an agitation was started by another political party and in order to control that agitation, an order under section 41 of the City Police Act was promulgated. On the 3rd or even earlier than the 3rd January 1958, that order was in force. Therefore, I would submit, as a matter of chronology, that the Government did not issue the prohibitory order to prevent this particular party from holding a meeting or making any demonstration. It was asked by the hon. Member Dr. Sreenivasan why, even if there was a prohibitory order, it was not relaxed when the Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam asked for permission to hold the meeting. I want the hon. Member Dr. Sreenivasan to place himself in the position of the Home Minister and also answer the question which I may put him. The Government issue an order prohibiting the holding of meetings and banning processions by one Party but, at the same time, allow agitation and the holding of meetings and organization of processions by another Party. Is it proper? Would they be justified? Would they not have been attacked in this very House as having made a discrimination?

13th February 1958]

Dr. A. SREENIVASAN : Excuse me. My explanation is this. I shall answer the question straightaway. The other Party in whose case the ban was introduced was intent on breaking the peace of the land. Here, it was not so. There was a difference in their objects.

* The Hon. Sri R. VENKATARAMAN : The permission to hold a meeting was applied for for the specific purpose of protesting against certain expressions used by the Prime Minister of India, that is, for agitation. You ban the meeting and procession to prevent agitation by one Party. You permit the meeting and procession to be organised for the same purpose by another Party.

If such discrimination had to be permitted and if even then what happened had occurred, who would be responsible? 5-40 p.m.

Dr. V. K. JOHN : Does it mean that hereafter all meetings are going to be banned because the ban was imposed in the case of two parties?

* The Hon. Sri R. VENKATARAMAN : It would depend on the purpose. The purpose in this case was to protest against certain remarks of the Prime Minister.

An Hon. MEMBER : What is wrong in protesting against any remarks by the Prime Minister?

* The Hon. Sri R. VENKATARAMAN : It will lead to breach of peace. I would like to ask whether it is proper to lay the blame on the Government for having done something in their discretion. If the Government had permitted the holding of the meeting, would they not have laid themselves open to the charge of discrimination, in this very House? After all, somebody has to take a decision and the real question in this case is whether the action of the Government was *bona fide* or *mala fide*. If you think that the Government have done something in this case with a view to creating trouble . . .

Sri P. T. RAJAN : I do not think Government will do that.

Dr A. SREENIVASAN : It might be for political purposes.

* The Hon. Sri R. VENKATARAMAN : Even the provision of freedom of speech in the Constitution carried certain reasonable restrictions. But, assuming that the Government had made a mistake in not having permitted this Party to hold a meeting, I underline the word 'assuming'—there was a certain obligation cast on persons belonging to political parties to observe the law and to take such appropriate action as the law permitted. In this case, the parties could have moved the High Court saying that the prohibition of the meeting amounted to denial of freedom of speech. Therefore, in every case where a person is not satisfied with an order of the Executive of the day, the remedy should be through established channels and not through resort to activities of his own. It is in this connection that it has been reminded that the Congress itself had done these things once and that, therefore, the others

[Sri R. Venkataraman] [13th February 1958

were following in its footsteps. In the case of the Congress the position was different. It could not disestablish a Government. But now the position is different. They can take the case of Kerala, for instance. Now, the moment the people of this country do not want a particular Party in power, it has to quit and no power on earth can prevent its quitting. It is not proper, therefore, now having that authority and power to change established Government through the ballot box, to resort to this democratic procedure? To-day in South Africa, people of Indian origin as well as local people have no right to vote and they had to resort to civil disobedience. This is the justification for civil disobedience. Where the Government of the day can be changed through the ballot box, it is but appropriate that the Opposition Parties and people who have faith in democracy should resort to this method and not to extra-constitutional methods.

DR. V. K. JOHN : This means that the Opposition Party should wait for five years till the next elections.

* THE HON. SRI R. VENKATARAMAN : I may say, Sir, that in Britain when the Party in power lost a series of bye-elections, it tendered its resignation even before the next elections. Here the same thing should be done.

SRI P. T. RAJAN : The Constitution has given freedom of speech. If you go wrong, you have a machinery to deal with it. You cannot anticipate wrong-doing.

* THE HON. SRI R. VENKATARAMAN : The law has two sides—the preventive and the punitive sides. In the case of the Mudukulathur incidents, the whole of the Press and large sections of the public were criticising the Government very wildly. At about the same time, a bye-election to Parliament was taking place in the Arantangi-Pattukottai-Tanjore constituency. The entire election campaign was launched on the basis of the alleged atrocities committed by the Government. But the people voted for the Congress and that is a clear verdict.

5-50 p.m. SRI P. T. RAJAN : Did the Arantangi people justify the action taken by the Government in Mudukulathur?

* THE HON. SRI R. VENKATARAMAN : They approved the action taken by the Government. After all, either we have faith in democracy or we do not have it.

SRI P. T. RAJAN : On a point of information, Sir. Did the Arantangi people justify the conduct of the Government in that particular bye-election?

* THE HON. SRI R. VENKATARAMAN : They are deemed to have approved all the appropriate action taken by the Government by electing their representative.

DR. A. SREENIVASAN : They must be satisfied.

* THE HON. SRI R. VENKATARAMAN : After all, it is very easy to fling abuse against others.

13th February 1958]

SRI P. T. RAJAN : Certainly not.

* THE HON. SRI R. VENKATARAMAN : We may leave it at that and proceed to the next question, viz., this new cry for a separate Tamil Nad or a separate Dravida Nad. So far as the plea for a separate Dravida Nad consisting of Andhra, Kerala and Karnataka States is concerned, as far as I could read through the present tempo of the respective Governments there, there seems to be no inclination to join such a Federation. Even on the question of language, I may point out that in the All-India session of the Congress, those Governments were in favour of Hindi.

SRI P. T. RAJAN : We do not want to interfere in the affairs of other people.

* THE HON. SRI R. VENKATARAMAN : So, at the present moment, it seems to be an impossible and impracticable thing. The second desire of some people is to have a separate Tamil State. They are not content with the existing Tamil boundaries but they also want areas in North Ceylon. Sir, to-day it is the accepted policy of International law and International equity that each country respects the territorial integrity of the other and does not in any way think of committing aggression on the other. And to say that we want a State, in which parts of areas which belong to other States, sovereign and independent States, should be with us, is not, I am afraid, in the best traditions of proper international conduct.

Sir, I will lightly touch upon one or two things which the Leader of the Opposition Dr. Lakshmanaswami Mudaliar said. He said that in this country the time had come for reducing the number of holidays. Sir, the Bill which is coming up before this House restricts the total number of holidays to seven and I am quite sure that it will receive the support of Dr. Lakshmanaswami Mudaliar when it comes up here.

Then, he also dealt with the question of conversion of rice and paddy fields for other purposes. On every occasion when people try to put land under food cultivation to other uses, the Government do look into the matter and then either they permit it or do not. Therefore, if in certain areas which he had seen there was some conversion, it might have been done naturally with the concurrence of the Government. We cannot impose a total ban on the conversion of paddy fields for other purposes. We have sometimes to start a sugar factory. We have to extend our housing scheme. We have sometimes to grow cotton for the purpose of new textile units that are coming up. It is on the consideration of all these facts that such conversion is allowed.

DR. V. K. JOHN : How much rice are the Government importing?

* THE HON. SRI R. VENKATARAMAN : Import of food may be due to two factors. Not only is it due to our food adjustment. There is a school of thought in India which says that out of the

[Sri R. Venkataraman] [13th February 1958

same acreage, we can produce certain types of crop and export it for better advantage and import food. After all, international commerce and trade has relative advantages and the produce of one country will be in demand in the foreign markets. Therefore, I do not think that anybody would object to imports as such but only when such imports have to be resorted to without any advantages, contervailing advantages, we have to criticise.

The hon. Member Sri Ponnuswamy Chettiar dealt with the handloom problem. I made a statement about it in the other House and I may assure this House that the Government are fully alive to the problem of the stagnation of handloom cloth now. They are trying to do their best in the matter.

DR. V. K. JOHN : What about Prohibition?

* THE HON. SRI R. VENKATARAMAN : So far as Prohibition is concerned, I am one who has complete faith in it. The reason is this. The amount of money which would fructify in the pockets
6 p.m. of the poor villager by total Prohibition has been calculated to be three times or more than the revenue we would get otherwise. On principle, I have not heard anybody saying a word against the policy of Prohibition. All the criticism against Prohibition is based on the inability of the Government to enforce 100 per cent the law as it stands. I am not sure whether we are able to enforce 100 per cent all the laws. The hon. Member would agree that notwithstanding the enactment of the Indian Penal Code 100 years ago, murders do occur. I quite agree that the endeavour of the Government should be to see that there are no violations of laws. It is with that view that a Bill to amend the Prohibition Act is proposed to be brought forward by my esteemed Colleague the Minister for Home. He wants to tighten up the provisions of the Act. The hon. Member Dr. John says that it is impossible to enforce it. I say it is possible. Unfortunately, Dr. John has a short memory. It was on this issue of Prohibition that we went before the people. Did they not endorse our programme?

DR. A. SREENIVASAN : The person who has voted for the Government Party himself indulges in illicit distillation.

* THE HON. SRI R. VENKATARAMAN : If my hon. Friend's regard for his countrymen is such, he has only to thank himself.

So far as the question raised by the teachers is concerned, my esteemed Colleague the Minister for Education would deal with it when he presents the Budget. Sir, I have done.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Is the hon. Member Sri Mohamed Raza Khan pressing his amendment?

SRI MOHAMED RAZA KHAN : It is usual, Sir, for the Hon. the Leader of the House to request the Opposition to withdraw the amendment. Even that the Hon. Minister has not done, Sir.

13th February 1958]

* THE HON. SRI R. VENKATARAMAN : It is true. It is now my privilege to request the Members of the Opposition to withdraw their amendment and allow the motion of thanks to be passed unanimously.

SRI MOHAMED RAZA KHAN : Sir, it is my privilege, as usual, to withdraw my amendment and I withdraw the same.

The amendment was, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. CHAIRMAN : I shall now put the original motion to vote. The question is—

"That an humble Address be presented to the Governor that the Members of the Madras Legislative Council thank him for the Address delivered to the Members of the Legislature on the 8th February 1958."

The motion was put and carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN : The House will now adjourn and meet again at 10 a.m. to-morrow.

The House then adjourned.

III.—PAPER LAID ON THE TABLE OF THE HOUSE.

* 75. *Short review of the activities of the Survey and Land Records Department for the first half of* 1956-57.

---

* Laid on the table of the House on 12th February 1958


தமிழ்நாடு சட்டமன்றப் பேரவை
TAMIL NADU LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
வாய்மையே வெல்லும்
TRUTH ALONE TRIUMPHS